

THE
CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

BY MEMBERS OF MENDON ASSOCIATION.

VOL. III.

JANUARY, 1826.

No. 1.

CONTENTS.

Sinners think it is impossible for them to be saved on the condition of disinterested love.—A Sermon, from Mark, x. 22	1	The Pilgrim's Progress in the Nineteenth Century	23
An Inquiry into the meaning of Romans, ix. 3	10	Inspiration	27
Memoir of Dr. Simon Jacobs	13	Anecdote	27
An Explanation of 1 Cor. iii. 23	17	A Strange Sight	28
Thoughts on the Sabbath	18	Anecdote of Dr. D——	28
		Religious Intelligence	30
		Dedication	32
		Ordinations and Installations	32

CONDITIONS.

1. THE CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE shall contain 32 octavo pages, be executed as it respects type and paper in the style of the Christian Spectator, and afforded to subscribers at \$1,50 a volume, payable in advance ; or \$2 paid at the end of six months.

2. Those who become responsible for five copies shall receive the sixth gratis.

3. No subscriptions are to be taken for less than a year ; and if notice of discontinuance is not given before the issuing of the last number, subscribers will be considered as desiring it the succeeding year.

4. This volume shall be published in Boston ; and though it will contain no more pages, it shall comprise considerably more matter, than either of the preceding volumes.

N. B. All communications to this work are to be sent, *post paid*, to the Centre Post-Office in Wrentham, Mass., directed to the Editors of the Christian Magazine, or to the office of T. R. MARVIN, Congress-street, Boston, by whom it is to be printed.

Boston :

PRINTED BY T. R. MARVIN.

1826.

THE CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. III.

JANUARY, 1826.

No. 1.

SERMON.

MARK, X. 22.—*And he was sad at that saying, and went away grieved: for he had great possessions.*

Our Saviour taught as one having authority. His preaching raised the admiration of some, and the curiosity of many. Multitudes of all denominations and classes of men followed him from place to place; some scribes who were teachers, some Pharisees who were sober and strict in their lives, some Sadducees who were lax in their sentiments, some publicans and sinners who were openly vicious in their practice, and some rulers who were the principal men in the nation. Of the class last mentioned, a young ruler of an amiable appearance and deportment, came to him with this serious and important question, "Good master, What shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" Jesus having directed him to keep the commandments, he promptly replied, "Master, all these have I observed from my youth. Then Jesus beholding him, loved him, and said unto him, one thing thou lackest: go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, take up the cross and follow me. And he was sad at that saying, and went away grieved: for he had great possessions."

VOL. III.

This declaration of Christ instantaneously stripped the young man of all his fond hopes of future happiness; for he was conscious that he never had, and thought that he never could, exercise that *disinterested* love, which Christ required as an indispensable condition of salvation. He was grieved, that he could not obtain heavenly treasures, without giving up his worldly possessions. He supposed, that he could never be saved on the condition which Christ proposed. The spirit of the text, therefore, leads us to conclude,

That sinners think it is impossible for them to be saved on the condition of *disinterested* love. I shall,

I. Show that *disinterested* love is the condition of salvation.

II. Show that sinners think it is impossible for them to be saved on this condition.

I. I am to show that *disinterested* love is the condition, upon which salvation is offered to sinners in the word of God. If we look into the Old Testament we shall find, that God requires pure, supreme, *disinterested* love, as the condition of his peculiar favour both in this life and in that which is to come. Moses having called all the people of God together, says, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord:

1

181711

12

and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart." The love which God here requires as the condition of temporal and spiritual favours, is the same disinterested love, upon which Christ says all the law and prophets do hang. Our Saviour abundantly inculcated *disinterested* love as the condition of salvation. In his sermon on the mount, he insisted largely upon the nature and necessity of *disinterested* love, in opposition to the *selfish* principles and practices of the scribes and Pharisees. "But I say unto you, Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, bless them that curse you, and pray for them that despitefully use you. And as ye would that men should do unto you, do ye also so to them likewise. For if ye love them that love you, what thank have ye? for sinners also love those that love them. And if ye do good to them which do good to you, what thank have ye? for sinners also do even the same. And if ye lend to those of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? for sinners also lend to sinners, to receive as much again. But love your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the highest: for he is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil. Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful." Our Lord also spake a parable, on purpose to show, that no man can be saved upon *selfish* principles, and consequently, that *disinterested* love is the only condition of salvation. "The ground," says he, "of a certain rich man

brought forth plentifully: and he thought within himself, saying, What shall I do because I have not where to bestow my fruits? And he said, 'This will I do: I will pull down my barns, and build greater: and there will I bestow all my fruits and my goods. And I will say to my soul, Soul thou hast much goods laid up for many years: take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry. But God said unto him, 'Thou fool, this night shall thy soul be required of thee: then whose shall all those things be which thou has provided? So is he that layeth up treasure *for himself*, and is not rich toward God.'" It was one of Christ's common sayings, "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever loseth his life for my sake, shall find it." This was saying in the plainest and strongest terms, that *disinterested* love is the only condition of salvation. He said, "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me." When a certain lawyer stood up, and tempted him, saying, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? He said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do and thou shalt live. But he, willing to justify himself, said unto Jesus, And who is my neighbour?" In answer to this, Christ spake the

parable of the good Samaritan, and said to the querist, "Go and do thou likewise;" that is, Go and exercise the same *disinterested* benevolence, and thou shalt be saved. But that nothing short of disinterested love is the condition of salvation, the Apostle Paul plainly asserts and strikingly illustrates in the thirteenth chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians. "Though, says he, I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." By charity the Apostle means that charity which seeketh not her own, or that *disinterested* love, which stands directly opposed to all *selfish* affections, exercises, and actions. It is true indeed, both Christ and the apostles represent either faith, or repentance, or submission, as entitling any one to salvation. But it is to be remembered, that all those exercises are only so many different modifications and expressions of that love, which is *disinterested*. So that if we search through the Bible, we shall find that disinterested benevolence, in some form or other, is the only condition, upon which eternal life is offered to sinners. I now proceed to show,

II. That sinners are ready to think it is impossible for them to be saved on this condition. So the young man supposed. At first he thought he was in a fair

way to heaven. But as soon as Christ mentioned *disinterested* love as the condition of eternal life, his heart and his hopes failed him, he went away grieved and desponding, and supposing it to be impracticable to comply with the terms of salvation which Christ proposed. Nor was he alone in this opinion; for those who stood by and heard the condition, expressed the same sentiment, and with astonishment exclaimed, "Who then can be saved?" When Christ reproved those who followed him for the sake of the loaves, and implicitly told them, that they must exercise disinterested love in order to obtain his favour, "They said, this is a hard saying, who can hear it?" And from that time, many of his disciples went back and followed him no more." They felt as though they never could be saved upon the condition of *disinterested* love. While Paul supposed the divine law required nothing but selfishness, he felt blameless, and entertained high hopes of heaven; but when his mind was enlightened and his conscience awakened to understand the true meaning of the law, he saw his selfishness condemned by it, and despaired of mercy upon the condition of disinterested love. The single prohibition, which says, "Thou shalt not covet," that is, thou shalt not be *selfish*, carried death to his hope; because he supposed it was impossible for such a selfish creature as he found himself to be, to exercise that disinterested love to which the promise of salvation is made. Such have been the views of all sinners in the same situation. They have found it easy to love themselves supremely, but to love God more than themselves, and to prefer

his glory to their own eternal happiness, they have found to be extremely difficult, even as difficult as for a camel to go through the eye of a needle. They have really supposed it to be absolutely impossible for them to exercise that pure, disinterested love, to which the promise of salvation is made to them in the gospel.

But here it may be proper to inquire, why they think it is impossible to be saved on the condition of *disinterested* benevolence. They must see something in disinterested love, which is totally different from all *selfish* affections; otherwise they could not imagine it to be so extremely difficult to exercise it. But it is certain, in the first place, that their difficulty in exercising *disinterested* love, does not arise from its being *unreasonable*. God is as worthy to be loved as themselves. Christ is as worthy to be loved as themselves. And their fellow-men are as worthy to be loved as themselves. It is, therefore, altogether reasonable, that they should love God supremely, and their fellow-men as themselves. And they always approve of disinterested love, wherever they think they see it acted out. Nor do they ever fail of blaming themselves as well as others, for feeling and expressing selfishness in any form whatever. The young ruler did not presume to object against disinterested affections and actions as unreasonable or absurd. Indeed, it is not in the power of the human mind to discover any thing improper or absurd in universal, impartial, and disinterested benevolence. Reason dictates, that this is the only proper and virtuous affection, that rational creatures can exercise towards their Creator and one another.

If there were any thing inconsistent, improper, or absurd in sinners exercising disinterested benevolence, they might well suppose it is impossible for them to be saved on this condition. But this is not the case, nor can they consistently pretend this to be the case, for they always approve of others for acting from disinterested motives.

Nor again, do sinners suppose it is impossible for them to be saved on the condition of disinterested benevolence, because there is no need of their having such benevolent affections, in order to be completely and eternally happy. They know the nature of selfishness, which tends to make rational beings miserable. And sometimes they are convinced by their own experience, that with their present feelings it is impossible for them to be happy in this life, or the next. And this is the real truth. No individual, or number of individuals, can be in a state of solid, permanent happiness, without that pure, disinterested love, which the gospel requires. It appears absolutely necessary, therefore, that God should require disinterested love from all the subjects of his holy, happy kingdom. If God means to make his rational creatures happy, he must do it on the principle of disinterested benevolence. This sinners are capable of seeing; and of course they cannot suppose, that God unnecessarily imposes on them the hard condition of disinterested love in order to escape the wrath to come, and enjoy the blessedness of heaven. Though the young ruler was grieved when he heard the condition of salvation, yet Christ was not severe, but kind and compassionate, in pointing out to him the only possible way of inherit-

ing eternal life. And he does not appear to blame Christ on this account. Nor can any sinners justly view this condition of salvation, as an unnecessary hardship. Their reason and conscience, notwithstanding the depravity of their hearts, tell them, that disinterested love is not only a reasonable, but a necessary condition of their being freed from all misery, and put into the enjoyment of all good. No other qualification can possibly prepare them for the inheritance of the saints in light.

Nor again, do sinners suppose it is impossible for them to be saved on the condition of disinterested love, because they know themselves to be *incapable* of exercising such a holy affection. They are conscious of being able to love and hate, choose and refuse; and to exercise *benevolent* as well as *malevolent* affections. The amiable young man was possessed of all the rational powers, which were necessary to perform the most benevolent actions. This appears from his own declaration, that he had externally obeyed all the divine commands from his youth. It was completely in his power to comply with the conditions of salvation which Christ proposed. He was able to sell all he had, and convert it to benevolent purposes, and to take up his cross and follow him. For this was soon after actually done, by the primitive christians; and the most worldly-minded, selfish sinners are equally capable of exercising pure, disinterested benevolence.

The question still returns, why do sinners think it is impossible for them to be saved on the condition of disinterested love? After what has been said, there seems to be but one plain, posi-

tive, satisfactory answer to be given to this question. Sinners think, it is impossible for them to be saved on the condition of disinterested love, because of the total depravity and selfishness of their hearts. This the young man most sensibly felt. "He was very much grieved, because he was very rich, and supremely attached to the world." He could not bear to give up his great possessions for the sake of Christ, or for the sake of the gospel, or for the sake of the salvation of his own soul. It is as hard to the selfish heart of one sinner as to the selfish heart of another; to give up all his earthly treasure, for the sake of having treasure in heaven. Every sinner has a carnal mind, which no motives taken from time or eternity can reconcile to God and to the terms of salvation proposed in the gospel. For while he loves himself supremely, he cannot be willing to give up his present and future happiness, for the glory of God and the good of the universe; he cannot be willing to lose his life, that he may find it, or to leave it to the wise, holy, and sovereign will of God, to save or destroy him, though he knows this is his duty, and would secure his salvation, if he would only exercise such pure, supreme, disinterested love to God. The entire selfishness of sinners, therefore, convinces them, that it is morally impossible for them to be saved on the condition of disinterested love.

IMPROVEMENT.

1. If it be entirely owing to the selfishness of sinners, that they suppose they cannot be saved on the condition of disinterested love; then their inability to embrace the gospel is alto-

gether criminal and inexcusable. It is true, that they are under one kind of inability to love God, to repent of sin, to believe in Christ, or to do any thing in a right and acceptable manner. This we are plainly taught in scripture. Moses told the corrupt and totally selfish Israelites, "Ye cannot serve the Lord, for he is an holy God." Christ said, "No man can come to me, except the Father who sent me draw him." And the Apostle declares, "The carnal mind is enmity against God, not subject to his law, neither indeed can be: so then they that are in the flesh *cannot* please God." But this is a *moral* inability, which arises from the free, voluntary, selfish exercises of the heart, and is in its own nature entirely sinful and inexcusable. There is an essential difference between *moral* and *natural* inability. If sinners were incapable of distinguishing selfishness from benevolence, they would be under a natural inability of exercising that benevolence, to which the promise of salvation is made, and this would be a sufficient excuse for not complying with the terms of the gospel. But they know, that selfishness and benevolence are totally different in their nature and tendency, and that the former is sinful and the latter is virtuous. "Therefore to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." Sinners have no right to plead sin as an excuse for sin, or to plead selfishness as an excuse for not exercising that pure disinterested love to God and man, which the gospel requires as an indispensable condition of salvation. When they plead, as they almost universally do, their inability to love God and embrace the gospel, they plead no other than a *moral* inability,

which arises from their entire selfishness, which is the essence of all sin and criminality, and which is no better excuse than Satan has for hating God and all good, with all his heart. If they would only express their inability in plain and intelligible language, they would say they love themselves so much, that they cannot love God, that they love selfishness so much, that they cannot love benevolence, that they love the happiness of this world so much, that they cannot love the enjoyment of God and the happiness of heaven. And this inability, instead of excusing them, must condemn them in the sight of God, and their own consciences.

2. It appears from what has been said, that sinners have no ground to think God is *insincere* in offering them salvation upon the condition of disinterested benevolence. Sinners think and often say, that there can be no sincerity in God's offering to save them, upon unreasonable and impracticable terms. They say he knows, that they cannot and will not accept of salvation, upon the condition of disinterested love; and therefore he cannot be sincere in offering them salvation upon terms which he knows they cannot and will not comply with. We could not indeed see any sincerity in God's offering salvation to sinners on the condition, that they should ascend into heaven, (that is, to bring Christ down from above,) or that they should descend into the deep, (that is, to bring up Christ from the dead,) for it is naturally impossible for them to perform these conditions. But what saith God to every sinner? "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth; that is the word of faith which we

preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Thus God offers salvation to sinners in the gospel, on the lowest and easiest terms possible. Nothing can prevent their accepting salvation, but their freely and voluntarily rejecting it.

3. It is of importance, that God should offer salvation to sinners on the condition of disinterested benevolence, though he knows beforehand, that they will reject his offer. The condition is easy and practicable. They are able and ought to exercise disinterested benevolence, and nothing can hinder them from exercising it, but their totally depraved and selfish hearts. They are, however, naturally blind to their native depravity and selfishness. They are not willing to believe, that they hate God, hate Christ, hate holiness, and hate salvation itself, until they are brought to the trial. God brings them to the trial, by freely and sincerely offering them salvation, upon the kind and gracious condition of disinterested love, which he knows they hate and will absolutely refuse to exercise, though they are sensible their refusal will prove their destruction. There is no other way, by which God can demonstrate to sinners themselves and to the universe, that they are totally depraved, selfish, and opposed to all good, but by his offering them salvation upon the condition of *disinterested* benevolence, and *their* refusing it. The amiable young man, whom Jesus beholding loved, would always perhaps, in this world, have appeared very different, if *Christ* had not offered, and *he* had not rejected salvation, on the condition of *dis-*

interested benevolence. He never appeared so perfectly *selfish* to himself, nor to others, before he rejected salvation, rather than to give up his possessions and give God the supreme affection of his heart.

4. Since *disinterested* benevolence is the only condition of salvation, there is no propriety in directing sinners *how* to embrace the gospel. They are not very often satisfied with being told, that disinterested love is the only condition, upon which they can find acceptance with God; they want to know how they shall exercise this pure, holy love. But it does not belong to the preachers of the gospel to answer this impertinent and absurd question. It is sufficient for them clearly to state the condition of salvation, and leave it to sinners to find out how they shall freely and voluntarily perform it. Christ did no more than this, in preaching the gospel to the young man. He plainly and intelligibly taught him disinterested love, and promised him salvation on condition of his exercising and expressing such a holy, virtuous affection. The young man clearly understood the condition, for it grieved him to the heart, to be required to give up all his selfish feelings and possessions in order to be saved. But though Christ saw his anxiety and distress, he did not undertake to tell him *how* he should become willing to sell all he had and give to the poor, and come and follow him. He knew how to love God supremely as well as he knew how to love himself and the world supremely. Sinners know how to love God supremely, as well as to hate him supremely. They know how to love God supremely, as well as to love the world supremely.

They know how to exercise benevolence, as well as to exercise selfishness. If the young man had asked Christ how he should become willing to give up all and follow him, and become truly benevolent, he would not have told him, any more than he could have told him how to go away grieved. All that the ministers of the gospel have to tell sinners, is, the *condition* upon which they may be saved, and not *how to be willing* to perform that condition. All who pretend to do this, undertake to do what they have no right, nor power to do.

5. Since disinterested benevolence is the only condition of salvation, ministers have no right to substitute any other or lower conditions of salvation. This is what many preachers of the gospel presume to do. After they have stated the only condition of salvation, and told sinners they must do what Christ required the young man to do in order to be saved, sinners generally complain that they cannot perform that condition. Their hearts, they say, are totally depraved, and they cannot exercise disinterested benevolence, and love God supremely; of course they ask what they must do to get disinterested benevolence, or a heart to love God supremely? Many ministers see no other way to relieve sinners in this deplorable situation, than to alter and lower the terms of salvation, and direct and advise them to do something which their depraved hearts are willing to do in order to get a good heart, and exercise true benevolence.

6. Since disinterested love is the only condition of salvation, we may see why this doctrine is more disagreeable to all sinners, than any other doctrine of the

gospel. All the doctrines of the gospel clearly understood are disagreeable to sinners, because they are all founded on disinterested benevolence. But as they do not generally see, that the doctrine of decrees, the doctrine of election, the doctrine of divine agency, the doctrine of unconditional submission, and various other doctrines, are founded on disinterested benevolence, so they do not dislike those doctrines so much as the doctrine on which they are founded. This comes directly and sensibly across all their selfish desires, exertions, and hopes. They cannot love God, because he is a holy God. They cannot serve God because he is a holy God. They cannot please God, because he is a holy God. They cannot go backward, nor forward, nor stand still, without offending God. They find that every imagination of the thoughts of their hearts is evil, and only evil continually, and a transgression of that holy law, which requires pure disinterested love. All sinners of all descriptions are equally and totally opposed to that disinterested benevolence, which is the condition of salvation. Not only publicans and sinners, but scribes and Pharisees, who were externally righteous and apparently religious, were all opposed to the doctrine of disinterested benevolence, as it was plainly taught and inculcated by Christ. They were all ready to exclaim, "Who then can be saved?" All sinners now have the same opposition to this doctrine, that others have felt and expressed; for it strikes at the root of every false scheme of religion, and every false hope of salvation. All sinners whether Calvinists or Arminians, whether Unitarians or Universalists, wheth-

er externally religious or irreligious, whether awakened or unawakened are equally opposed to disinterested benevolence.— They can explain away all other doctrines on selfish principles so as to suit them; but they cannot explain away the doctrine of disinterested benevolence, upon any selfish principle, and therefore Arminians, moderate Calvinists, Methodists, Unitarians, and Universalists unitedly deny it, and exclaim, “Who then can be saved?” They virtually acknowledge, if disinterested benevolence be true, their different schemes of religion are false, and their hopes built upon them are false and fatal. And to give up a favourite scheme or a false hope, is like giving up the ghost. It carries death and despair in it to the best and worst of sinners. Let any doctrine of the gospel be clearly traced to its foundation, that is, disinterested benevolence, and every sinner in the world, will hate and oppose it. Let Christ’s precept, requiring us, “to do to others as we would, that others should do to us” be justly explained and understood, and it would be as generally hated and opposed, as the doctrine of total depravity, or the doctrine of election, or the doctrine of unconditional submission, for it is as plainly founded in disinterested benevolence as those doctrines are. In a word, all the reason, why sinners dislike and oppose any doctrines and duties of the gospel, is because they see or think they see, that they require that disinterested love, of which they are conscious they are destitute.

7. Since disinterested love is the only condition of salvation, it is vain and dangerous for secure sinners to wait for a more con-

venient season to embrace the gospel and secure the salvation of their souls. There are many sinners in this waiting posture. They intend to do what the gospel requires them to do in order to be saved, and have no doubt that they shall be able and willing to do whatever is necessary to be done to obtain eternal life when a favourable season presents. But if they would only consider that the condition of salvation is disinterested love, and that their own hearts are totally selfish, they would renounce the hope of a more convenient season of complying with that condition. Neither prosperity nor adversity, neither health nor sickness, nor the nearest prospect of death, would have the least tendency to change their hearts from selfishness to love. A season of trouble, affliction, and bereavement may come; or a season of awakenings and convictions may come; and these seasons may throw them into great anxiety and distress, and constrain them to cry, “What must we do to be saved?” But no other proper answer can be given them but that which requires them to love God supremely, or exercise disinterested benevolence. This their depraved, selfish hearts will tell them in a moment, it is morally impossible for them to do. They will therefore, either sink in sadness, grief, and despondence, or rise in vigorous enmity and opposition to God and the condition of salvation, quenching the spirit and stifling conviction. And in this deplorable situation, God may leave them to pine away and perish in their sins forever, as he has left thousands of other incorrigible sinners. No impenitent sinners have any ground to hope

or wait for a more convenient season to turn from selfishness to benevolence, and embrace the gospel; for such a season never will come. But,

8. Though it be morally impossible for sinners to exercise that disinterested love, which is the indispensable condition of salvation; yet it is not *naturally* impossible for them to be saved. This Christ observed, when the young man went away sad and hopeless of eternal life, on the condition of disinterested benevolence. "Jesus looked round about, and saith unto his disciples, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! And the disciples were astonished at his words. But Jesus answereth again, and saith unto them, Children, how hard is it for them that *trust* in riches to enter into the kingdom of God! It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. And they were astonished out of measure, saying among themselves, Who then can be saved? And Jesus looking upon them, saith, With *men* it is impossible, but not with *God*; for with *God* all things are possible." Though sinners are naturally dead in trespasses and sins; though they have a carnal mind which is enmity to God and not subject to his law, neither indeed can be; though they choose eternal death, rather than eternal life, upon the condition of disinterested love; yet God is able, in the day of his power, to make *them* willing to renounce their supreme attachment to themselves and to the world, and to accept salvation on the gracious and humiliating condition of disinterested benevolence. No sinner knows what God determines

to do with him; but let God's determination be what it may, his duty is to throw himself into his holy and sovereign hand, and penitently cry, "God be merciful to me a sinner."



Though the following article has been recently published in the Christian Spectator, yet, as it was communicated to us in Manuscript, by the Author, we think it expedient, considering its merits, to give it a place in the Christian Magazine.

For the Christian Magazine.

INQUIRY INTO THE MEANING OF ROMANS, IX. 3.

"*I could wish that I were accursed from Christ, for my brethren.*"

This sentence expresses an intensity of feeling seldom exhibited, and is accompanied with a solemn appeal to the Searcher of hearts. On such an occasion, Paul probably used words according to their obvious and common acceptance. The precise import of these words is the subject of our present inquiry.

Ἦχουμιν ἐγω, *I could wish*. This verb has the form of the indicative imperfect; but as is often the case, it is evidently used for the subjunctive. The connexion shows that Paul is speaking, not of his past, but of his present feelings.

"*I could wish*," *εἶναι ἀνάθεμα*, *to be accursed*. The word *anathema* is of Greek origin, and according to its etymology signifies *to set apart, to separate*, and answers to the Hebrew word *חָרַם* which means *separated from a common use*, and either *devoted exclusively to God*, or *devoted to utter destruction*. This word is found in the Old Testament forty times. In eight places it denotes *consecration*

to God, and in thirty-two places it means *abandoned by God*, and is translated in our English version, *accursed, a curse, or utter destruction*. In twenty places it has reference to the extermination of the Canaanites, and wherever it is used, it is emphatic, and generally is applied to idolatrous nations, as objects of divine wrath. Thus in Isaiah, "My sword shall be bathed in heaven, it shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my *curse* to judgment."

The Greek word *αναθεμα* is used only six times in the New Testament. Those Jews who imprecated on themselves the direst vengeance of heaven, if they eat before they had killed Paul, as it stands in the original, "anathematized themselves with anathemas." Paul uses the word five times. "No man speaking by the Spirit calleth Christ anathema." "If any man preach another gospel, let him be anathema." This he repeats, "If any man love not Christ, let him be anathema." These citations show that this was the most emphatic word among the Jews, to denote complete separation from the favour of God; and that in Paul's mind, it was most vividly associated with the thought of eternal perdition.

"I could wish myself accursed." *απο του Χριστου*, "an anathema from Christ." What does *απο του Χριστου* mean in this connexion? The word Anathema, when used in the sense of consecration, is commonly followed by the dative case, (Lev. 27: 28. Mic. 4: 13.) but when used in the sense of being accursed, excepting the passage under consideration, it is not followed by any case. As this word is employed to designate the idea of separation, as well as destruction, the most natural rendering of the preposi-

tion *απο*, is *from*. A passage of similar construction is found in the Epistle to the Thessalonians, "punished with everlasting destruction, *απο του προσωπου*, *from the presence of the Lord*." The word here translated *destruction*, is *ολεθρον*, derived from the verb *ολλυμι*, which is often used in the Septuagint as synonymous with *anathema*.

Some, however, suppose that *απο του Χριστου*, in our text, ought to be translated *after the example of Christ*, and that would make the sentence run thus, *I could wish myself to be an anathema, as Christ was an anathema*, referring to his crucifixion. But to this there is a serious objection; for though Paul says Christ was made *καταρα*, that is a *curse* for us, yet he says, "No man speaking by the Spirit calleth Christ *anathema*." With this passage before our eyes, it is difficult to see how Paul could apply the term *anathema*, in any sense, to Christ.

Others suppose that *απο του Χριστου* means *by Christ*, and would translate the passage, "I am willing to endure all kinds of temporal evils inflicted by Christ." To this I reply, the word *anathema* is used eight times in the Bible to denote entire consecration to God; above forty times it denotes destruction without remedy; but is never applied to crucifixion, trials, persecutions, the hidings of God's face, or any other class of sufferings inflicted on the children of God.

These remarks, I trust, have shown that the plain meaning of the expression *αναθεμα απο του Χριστου*, is *eternal separation from the Messiah's kingdom*. That this is the more obvious meaning no critic ever denied. But many have objected to the sentiment as being inconsistent, impossible, or

absurd. To these objections, and any others like them, I have one plain answer to give.

Our benevolent desires are not limited by our power to do good. Paul was not coldly deliberating about the power or consistency of exchanging his condition with that of his unbelieving brethren; but he had a most ardent and intense desire for their salvation; a vivid and distinct emotion filled his bosom—he uttered it just as it arose in his mind. What though it was a desire which he had no power to accomplish? When death is near, and the expiring sinner sees the pit opening to receive him, he has often exclaimed, “I would give all the world for the salvation of my soul.” This surely is not an irrational state of feeling. And yet to talk of purchasing heaven by the world, that is by the treasures which the world contains, is to propose an evident impossibility.

Paul is not the only instance of deep and intense feeling for others. The Israelites, ere the thunderings of Sinai had ceased, prostrated themselves before the calf that Aaron made. The wrath of God waxed hot against them. Moses saw this people, whom he had conducted from Egypt, whom he loved as the favourites of heaven, and with whom was most intimately connected the glory of God,—he saw them about to be swept away by the displeasure of the Almighty. He did not stand and look on calm and unmoved. “O forgive this people, and, if not, blot me out of the book thou hast written.” Were this the only place where the expression, “blot me out of thy book,” occurred, we could be at no loss what Moses intended to express, in this moment of overwhelming sorrow. God replies, “Him that sinneth I

will blot out of my book.” No one can doubt what God means by “blotting the sinner out of his book,” and surely he means the same thing that Moses did in the preceding verse.

Having endeavoured to show, in a philological way, the obvious import of the passage under consideration, and that no objection to this interpretation is valid, I proceed to adduce other considerations to confirm the views that have been given.

The moment before Paul uttered the text in question, he was contemplating the safety of those who are united to Christ. The joys of the redeemed, through unnumbered ages, are unfolded to his vision. His eye glances over universal nature—on the earth, in the heights above, in the depths beneath, no enemy is able to separate them from a Saviour’s love. But his brethren who are Israelites, to whom pertain the covenants and the promises, have rejected the Messiah, and are liable to be forever separated from his kingdom. And while he beholds, in prospect, multitudes descending to the world of woe, he *feels* for them. How much? A modern critic says enough to suffer the pangs of crucifixion. Another says, enough to endure those temporal calamities that were impending over the city of Jerusalem. But did not the whole tenor of Paul’s life evince that afflictions and persecutions were nothing to him compared with future glory? Was he not ever ready to die for the Gentile, as well as for the Jew? Was not death, in any shape, a welcome messenger to him? How then could a willingness to suffer *these evils* express a peculiar and vehement love for his brethren, the Jews?

Besides, Paul at this time, is speaking simply of the salvation of the soul. No earthly subject occupies his mind. The eternal destinies of man are before him. He sees believers in Christ secure and happy; but millions of his brethren are going to eternal perdition. And Oh! could they be saved, he would relinquish, not merely the trifles of earth, but even that bright crown of glory for which he had so long toiled, and laboured, and hoped. He calls Christ and the Holy Ghost to witness the *depth* of his feeling. He uses language the most *intense*. And all this to make, on the minds of the Jews, a deep and lasting impression. My brethren, though I tell you, that you are unbelievers, and reprobates of God, yet I love you; for you I could even relinquish my dearest hope if that might save you.

Our text, thus explained, teaches us how the most enlarged benevolence is excited in the pious mind. It is by contemplating immortal beings in their relation to God. Moses and Paul considered the Jews not as the creatures of a day, but as candidates for immortality; not as suffering temporal calamities merely, but as exposed to eternal destruction, when each exclaimed, O save thy people, and if not, let *me* perish!

The nearer to heaven a Christian rises in his contemplation,—the more his thoughts are conversant with future realities, the more vivid and distinct his apprehension of those scenes, which open on the departing soul, the more he reflects on the condition of immortal beings as hastening to the judgment seat, as entering on an eternity of joy, or of woe,—the more will he feel, and pray, and labor for the salvation of sinners.

P.

For the Christian Magazine.

MEMOIR OF

DOCT. SIMON JACOBS.

The subject of the following Memoir was born in Ward, Mass. May 19, 1794. He was naturally contemplative, and seems to have been the subject of serious impressions from his youth. He early commenced writing sketches of his life, in which he details, not so much his outward circumstances, as his views on religious subjects, the feelings of his heart, his various and strong temptations, and the means by which he was enabled to overcome them. His leisure moments, while very young, instead of being wasted in childish and sinful diversions, were many of them spent in meditation and secret prayer. Some of these prayers he has left in writing, in which he pleads, "first of all, and above all, that he may have Christ for his portion, here and hereafter." It was matter of deep solicitude with him, in early life, to know his spiritual state and prospects. For this purpose, he reduced to writing under several particulars, the evidences in favour of his own piety and against it; and then, by spreading the whole subject before the Lord, endeavored to obtain that satisfaction which he sought. He was not, at this time, forward and obtrusive in conversing upon his religious exercises, but rather the contrary. His general conduct, and his attention to the means of grace, were exemplary; but his friends were furnished with no decisive proofs of piety, and were left much in the dark, in regard to his spiritual concerns.

In the autumn of 1816, and the winter following, there was a general revival of religion in his native place. It is interesting to

learn from his diary, with what joy he watched the indications of its approach, and with what fervency he prayed for the progress and prevalence of the work. In the following instance of supplication, he shows the state of his mind, and the benevolence of his affections. "O thou most adorable Redeemer! I would give thee glory in the highest for the present appearances. Four or five of the unthinking part of my young friends are now inquiring what they shall do to be saved. Do thou, dear Savior, perfect the work which thou hast begun. Be merciful to this Church and Congregation, and to the Israel of God. Bring in thine own elect—even so Lord Jesus, Amen and Amen."

In the early part of this revival, the Christian friends of the young Mr. Jacobs were at a loss to know how to judge of him. He was not awakened, distressed, and to appearance changed, as others were; neither so far as they knew, had this ever been the case with him. Yet he seemed to be, and, no doubt, really was, highly interested and engaged in the work, and lost no opportunity either of enjoying or promoting it. At length, however, the truth could not be concealed. He opened his heart freely to his intimate friends, and gave them much reason to believe, that for some considerable time—from some unknown period of his youth, he had been a Christian. His light, which he lamented had been so long concealed, now shone forth with increasing brightness; and, on the third of March, 1817, in company with fifteen others, he openly professed himself on the Lord's side. On this occasion, he writes thus in his diary; "This has been to me a

solemn and important day indeed. I have joined myself to the visible church, and the vows of God are upon me. Thanks to my glorious Saviour, I was enabled to enjoy sweet communion with him, at his table. I know not that I ever enjoyed myself so much in my life before."

In the summer of 1818, having completed his professional studies, and been regularly licensed as a practising Physician, he removed and established himself at Oakham. Here he remained, till the period of his death. Although his professional business was very considerable, and his practice, for aught that appears, was uniformly satisfactory to his employers and friends, still it was not merely in the character of a Physician, that he distinguished himself, and became eminently useful. He shone also as a Christian; and as a Christian of no ordinary attainments. In conversing and praying with the sick, he was able, tender and pertinent.—In the Sabbath school—in the Prayer meeting and Conference room—indeed, in every place where he had an opportunity to do good, he was almost uniformly present, and ready, if called upon, to attempt it. Still, his piety was rather retiring than otherwise—he knew his place—and never affected to be wiser than his religious teachers or superiors. He wished every thing in religion to be done "decently and in order." By unremitted exertions for the benefit both of the body and the soul, he greatly endeared himself to the serious people among whom he resided, as well as to a more extended circle of acquaintances and friends.

But he was not exempt from the common fate of men. He

was fast accomplishing his work on earth, and preparing for a removal to higher scenes. In the autumn of 1824, he was attacked with a fever, which soon deprived him of his reason, and, in a few weeks terminated his earthly existence. Not many months before his death, he was married to the only daughter of Rev. Mr. Tomlinson, of Oakham, whom he has left, a lonely and afflicted widow, to deplore her loss.

There are several respects, in which Dr. Jacobs deserves to be exhibited as an example to survivors.—One of these is, his *early piety*. He remembered his Creator in the days of his youth. He seemed to have little inclination for the common amusements of the young, and gave his earliest and best days to the service of the Redeemer. He even commenced writing his religious exercises, when he was little more than a child. Still, he was led by the Holy Spirit in such a way as to keep him humble. The impression that he was an *extraordinary youth*, under which some young Christians have unhappily fallen, and of which nothing but bitter experience in future years will ordinarily rid them, it is not known that he ever received.

It was eminently true of Doct. Jacobs, as appears from his diary, that he *acknowledged God in all his ways*. In several instances, we find him dedicating himself to God, and writing and signing the act of self-consecration, with his own hand. Indeed, this seems to have been his constant practice, at the beginning of the year.—He noticed the hand of God in the preservation of his life; and with this view his successive *birth days* were observed as seasons of special solemnity. On one of them, he writes as follows: "I am now

twenty two years of age. Thus far hath the Lord led me on—thus far hath he preserved me. I give thee glory, O Lord, for all the mercies I have received from thee, the year past—above all, for the light of thy countenance, and the continued supplies of thine Holy Spirit. . . . Have I considered properly, and as I ought, that all my ways are ordered by God—and that every thing I have experienced, whether in prosperity or affliction, is a part of his eternal counsel? Have I been duly thankful to God for his goodness to me, with respect both to temporal and spiritual favours—considering that they all come through the intercession of my blessed Redeemer? Have I been, and am I now, humble, in any measure as I ought to be for my ingratitude and extreme sinfulness? Have I grown any better, the year past? Have I increased in any of the Christian graces and virtues? My blessed Redeemer, I feel that I am nothing. Be thou in me, and unto me, all things that I need."—He devoutly acknowledged the hand of God, in all the leading and in most of the common events of his life. Thus when about to offer himself for examination and license to practise medicine, we find him referring the case to God, and seeking his direction and blessing. Afterwards, when contemplating a removal to a particular place, he writes, "O Lord God Almighty, if it is thy will that I go to ———, do thou prepare the way for it. But if it is not for my good and thy glory, do thou prevent it. Do thou mete out the lot of my habitation for me. Direct my thoughts and my feet, and lead me, as thou didst Abraham of old." And afterwards, when established in the

practice of medicine, there is scarcely a case of difficulty noted in his journal, in respect to which he does not seek the direction and blessing of God. Indeed prayer had become to him, in a sense, habitual; and wherever he went, or whatever he undertook, the object before him was made, of course, the subject of prayer.

It may be seen from the example under consideration, that the practice of the medical profession need not, in ordinary cases, interfere with an attendance on the means of grace. Doct. Jacobs had many calls, as a Physician. The extent of his practice, for one of his years and standing, was respectable. Yet he seldom was absent, either from the house of God, or from meetings for religious conference and prayer. He so planned and arranged his professional visits, as to make them consist with an almost uniform attendance upon the means of grace. We think other Physicians, if they were similarly disposed, might be able, in most cases, to do the same.

The benefit of a *pious* Physician among a people, is also strongly illustrated in the case before us. Doct. Jacobs was scarcely more useful in his profession, than as an enlightened and judicious Christian. In his visits to the sick, he was able to instruct them, and if requested, to pray with them. He thus administered comfort to the soul, as well as help to the body. In different parts of the town, where his business called him, he ever appeared in character as a Christian. His influence was strong, and it was uniformly exerted in favor of the truth. Both by precept and example, he studied to recommend and enforce the religion of

the Saviour. In a season of revival in Oakham, during his residence there, his labours were great, and were greatly blessed. The happy results of them can never be estimated, till they are seen in the light of the judgment day. The good people in that place will not soon forget the earnestness with which he pleaded for them before the throne of grace, or his benevolent exertions to promote their spiritual and eternal welfare.—In view of an example such as this, how important it appears, that Physicians should be *pious men*! What class in society have better opportunities of usefulness? What class have the means of accomplishing greater good? May the spirit of grace soon be poured upon the Physicians of our country, that those who are called to prescribe for the diseased body, may be qualified also to administer consolation to the never dying soul.

The subject of the preceding remarks may be exhibited to all classes of readers, as one who made religion the business of every day, and who carried it with him into all the duties and avocations of life. He did not regard the world as the principal thing, and the concerns of the soul, as a mere secondary object. He did not attend to religion, or converse about it, merely to fill up intervals of time, when he had nothing else to do, or to say. But he was one of the happy few, who not only seek, but *seem* to seek, first and chiefly, the kingdom of God and his righteousness—who, feeling that they have been redeemed at an inestimable price, make it their study and endeavour to glorify God, in their bodies and spirits which are his.—When will Christians generally

become more wise on this subject? When will they so live, that beholders may see, that they regard not chiefly those things which are seen and temporal, but those which are not seen and eternal—that all around may take knowledge of them, that they have been with Jesus? E.

For the Christian Magazine.

AN EXPLANATION OF 1ST CORINTHIANS, III. 23.

"And ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's."

The most important question relative to the meaning of these words, and that in the solution of which every reader feels the deepest interest is doubtless this: *In what sense is Christ God's?* That he is God's, in some sense or other, the express language of the Apostle places beyond all doubt. "And ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." If we attend a moment to the two preceding verses with which this passage is intimately connected, we shall see that Christ is God's, in the same general sense in which all things else are said to be the believer's. "Therefore let no man glory in men, for all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." Now in what sense were Paul, and Apollos, and Cephas, and the world, and life, and death, and things present, and things to come, the property of believers at Corinth? To this it is replied, they were all, either directly or indirectly, instrumental of promoting the good of these believers. It is not known that they were, in any other sense,

theirs, than as they were the means, or the instruments of promoting their good. In the same general sense, these believers were Christ's: they were instrumental in promoting the glory of Christ. In the same sense, Christ himself is God's: he is instrumental of promoting the glory of God. The plain import of the passage, "Ye are Christ's and Christ is God's," is, therefore, this; "*The Church is subservient to the glory of Christ, and Christ subservient to the glory of God, as all things else are to the good of the Church.*" As an illustration of this truth, it might easily be shown. 1st. That all things are subservient to the good of the Church. 2d. That the Church is subservient to the glory of Christ. 3d. That Christ is subservient to the glory of God. But to most of my readers, these propositions are too plain to need any particular illustration. It is thought that merely naming them presents the sense of the text so fully, as to render any further explanation superfluous.

But here some may be ready to inquire, whether the fact that Christ is God's, even if he be his, in the sense above explained, does not imply that he is inferior to God? In reply to this question, I admit that Christ, in his official capacity as Mediator between God and man, is inferior to God. When he took upon him the office of Mediator, he *humbled* himself, and voluntarily consented to act a part, in the work of redemption, subordinate to the Father. Accordingly we learn from Scripture, that although he was "in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God; he made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being

found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." But the fact, that Christ sustains an office in the work of redemption below that of God the Father, that he has voluntarily become his servant, and, in his office as Mediator, is instrumental of promoting his glory, does not prove that he is originally, or by nature, inferior to him. The circumstance that Christ is said to be "God's," in the passage under consideration, no more proves that he is by nature unequal to the Father, than the expression just preceding it, "all things are yours," proves, that Paul, and Apollos, and Cephas, who are included in these all things, were inferior to the Corinthians. These Apostles were, indeed, in the gospel of Christ, servants to the Corinthians, and as such were instrumental in promoting their good. On this account they are, with propriety, said to be theirs. But all this is perfectly consistent with their being naturally equal, and even superior to them. So Christ, who voluntarily consented to perform the office of Mediator between God and man, and is, in the faithful discharge of the duties of his office, glorifying the Father, may be said to be God's, without the least implication of original inferiority.

A.

From the Christian Observer.

THOUGHTS ON THE SABBATH, UNDER
THE CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION.

PART III.

The appropriation of one day in seven to the worship of God and other religious exercises, having been made a branch of the moral law as summed up in the

Ten Commandments, and that law being confessedly, with respect to nine of the commandments, of universal and perpetual obligation; nothing more is needful to prove the authority of the fourth commandment, under the Gospel Dispensation, than to show that it has not been abrogated in the New Testament.

Our blessed Saviour in his sermon on the mount, hath assured us, in the most explicit terms, that it was not his design to abrogate any part of the moral law. — *Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled.* Matt. v. 17, 18. He also denounced a curse upon any one, who, by his conduct and doctrine, should set aside the law. — *Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.* Matt. v. 19.

Our Saviour was undoubtedly speaking of the moral law, as contained in the Ten Commandments; for, immediately after these declarations he proceeded to expound the sixth, seventh and third commandments, as parts of that law of which he was discoursing, with a view to remove the false glosses which the Jews had put upon them, and to show their spiritual nature and their extent.

The perpetual obligation of the whole moral law cannot be expressed in stronger terms than those which our Saviour has used. If it had been his design to rescind a tenth part of the law, he surely would not have declared in this solemn manner, that not one jot

or tittle of it should be rescinded.

The same doctrine is taught by the Apostle Paul in Romans, iii. 31.—*Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: Yea, we establish the law.* But an important branch of the law is made void through faith, if the gospel annuls the obligation of the fourth commandment.

Let us then weigh the import of those passages in the New Testament which have been thought by some to imply an abrogation of the fourth commandment; and consider whether they are capable of a sound interpretation which is consistent with these plain declarations of our Redeemer and his Apostle.

An opinion has been adopted, that the appointment of the first day of the week for the publick religious exercises of Christians, is a tacit abrogation of the fourth commandment which appoints, the seventh day for the celebration of the Sabbath. But it is obvious that this change is merely circumstantial, and does not interfere with the essence of the command. The last day of the week was undoubtedly appropriated by the fourth commandment; but it is remarkable, that the words may be applied to any day in the seven. We are enjoined to pursue our ordinary labours during six days, and on every seventh day to rest. This injunction is fulfilled, whatever day of the seven be the day of rest.

The reason given in this commandment for the observance of the institution is, that it pleased God to occupy six days in the creation of heaven and earth, and to rest from his work on the seventh day. Our regards are not diverted from a due consideration

of God's love in creating us, by the alteration of the day appointed to the Sabbath; though we are thereby directed to the celebration of a blessing superior to that of creation.

It is worthy of observation, that during the Jewish Dispensation, another act of love on the part of our gracious Creator, is mentioned as the reason for observing a sabbatical rest.—*Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm. Therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day.* Deut. v. 15. Hence we see, that the motive for observing one day in seven, as a Sabbath to the Lord, may be changed, without any change in the commandment.

Our Saviour seems to have alluded to a future change in the day of the week, to be appropriated to the Christian Sabbath, when he declared that he was *Lord of the Sabbath.* Mark, ii. 28. A consideration of the context will show, that this is the most natural interpretation of his words. He had been vindicating the conduct of his disciples, who, to satisfy their hunger, had plucked the ears of corn and eat them, as they went through the corn fields on the Sabbath-day, and had been showing that works of necessity and mercy were proper on the Sabbath. On this occasion he declared, *that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath,* ver. 27, and then added—*Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.* The exercise of Christ's authority over the Sabbath, was a consequence resulting from the former declaration, *that the Sabbath was made for man.* Now if he designed to

inform us that the Sabbath would be abolished, the premises and conclusion are by no means coincident. The words of our Lord must then have this import: "The Sabbath was a gracious institution, designed for the benefit of man, therefore I will take away this benefit from him." Whereas, if we suppose that these words had respect to the celebration of our redemption, a mercy greatly superior to that of creation, or the deliverance from Egyptian bondage, the whole sentence is beautifully connected and of gracious import. It is as if our Lord had said, "Since the institution of the Sabbath was designed as a favor to man, and has hitherto directed his attention to the celebration of that love and power which created the heavens and the earth; and has also reminded the chosen nation of their deliverance from the most oppressive bondage; I will so regulate the day as to direct the attention of my disciples to the greatest of all mercies,—the completion of my labours for their eternal redemption."

I am aware that a third sense may be put upon these words of our Saviour. They may be understood as expressive of a design to soften, (according to the ideas of some,) the rigours of the sabbatical institution. But I hope I have sufficiently shown, that our Lord introduced no new doctrine respecting the Sabbath, when he declared that works of necessity and mercy were consistent with the sanctification of that day, and that he did not in any other respect alter the law of that institution as delivered by Moses and the Prophets.* Indeed, the re-

laxation of the fourth, or any other commandment, would prove a curse instead of a blessing to mankind. *For the law is holy, and the commandment holy and just and good.* Romans, vii. 12. If it had been the design of our Lord to abolish, under the Christian Dispensation, the institution of a Sabbath, I do not see how he could have spoken of it in terms of respect in relation to an event which he knew would not happen until forty years after the commencement of that dispensation.

But when he was privately giving his disciples an account of the dreadful calamities which would take place at the siege of Jerusalem, he directed them to pray, that their *flight might not be on the Sabbath-day.* Matt. xxiv. 20, since in that case, they must either have been inattentive to the peculiar duties of the day, through the multiplicity of worldly concerns which would then press upon them, or have neglected their own safety through fear of breaking the commandment.

The principal passages in the New Testament, which, at first sight, seem to favour the idea of the abolition of the Sabbath, under the Gospel Dispensation, occur, 1st, in Rom. xiv. 5. *One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.* And 2d, that in Colossians, ii. 16. *Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-days.* But if the sense of these passages be determined by the context, it will appear that they were written with a reference to the ceremonial law, which was designed to be abolished by the Gospel Dispensation; and that they are

* See Thoughts on the Sabbath during the Jewish Dispensation.—Christian Magazine, Vol. II, page 344.

not contrary to the idea of a Christian Sabbath.

In order to a right understanding of these passages, it is necessary to remember, that the Gospel Dispensation did not supersede the Jewish by a sudden transition, and immediately render the Jewish observances unlawful to all who received Christ as their Saviour. It was the design of God, that a gradual change should take place; so that, on the one hand, no violence should be done to the consciences of those, who had been educated in the observance of the ceremonial law; and on the other, that the Gentile believers should not be brought under the yoke of the Jewish ritual. The Apostles themselves, if we may judge, by the conduct of Peter, were not fully informed at the day of Pentecost, of the intended abolition of the ceremonial law; for he conceived himself bound by the Jewish doctrine of clean and unclean meats, when he was invited to go and preach the Gospel to Cornelius, who was a Gentile; though afterwards we find Peter declaring in the first Christian synods that the ceremonial law was a *yoke, which neither their fathers nor they were able to bear*. Acts, xv. 10. St. Paul, indeed, seems to have had a full display made to him at once of the whole system of the Gospel; yet he continually taught the lawfulness of Jewish observances to those who had been educated as Jews, and himself conformed to them upon all proper occasions.

Many contentions must have arisen during this state of things, amongst the Christian converts, respecting the authority of the Jewish ritual; and to such contentions, the Apostle is evidently referring in the passages above

cited.—*Him that is weak in the faith, receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that he may eat all things; another who is weak eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not, and let not him which eateth not, judge him that eateth. One man esteemeth one day above another, another esteemeth every day alike. If we understand this last clause as relating to the institution of the ceremonial law, it will then be agreeable to the scope of the context, and will contradict no other part of the New Testament, but if we conceive of it as intended to cast a slight on the Christian Sabbath, we shall then set it in direct opposition to the declarations of our Saviour, as well as to the doctrines and conduct of the Apostles. They acted, no doubt, by the divine direction, in appointing the first day of the week, instead of the last, to be the day on which Christians should hold their publick assemblies for religious worship, on which they should break bread in remembrance of Christ's death; and on which publick collections should be made for the benefit of their distressed brethren. To this day they gave the venerable title, THE LORD'S DAY, a title which has been handed down in the Christian Church through every succeeding age, as appropriated to the Christian Sabbath.*

The same reasoning is applicable, to the passages which I have quoted from the Epistle to the Colossians. It is evident from the context, that the Apostle was speaking of the ordinances of the ceremonial law, for the neglect of which no Christian was to be condemned. *Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances, that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nail-*

ing it to his cross. Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-days. Colossians, ii. 14, 16. In this passage the Apostle is clearly speaking of burdensome ordinances; of something that was against them, and contrary to the spirituality of the Gospel. But can any pious person conceive, that the spending of one day in seven in spiritual services, in the delightful employment of social worship, and other religious exercises, could be ranked by the holy Apostle amongst the things which were against Christianity, and contrary to it? Was that institution, which the people of God had been commanded to call a *delight, holy of the Lord and honorable*, now to be esteemed of so carnal a nature as to be ranked amongst the things, which Christ took out of the way, nailing it to his cross? Were those holy persons, who had been accustomed to adopt the language of the Psalmist, *I was glad when they said unto me, let us go up to the house of the Lord*, now taught to esteem a day spent in such services, as a part of that yoke, which neither the Apostles nor their fathers were able to bear? We must destroy all just ideas of the effects, which the preaching of the Gospel was intended to produce, before we can adopt such an interpretation of the Apostle's words. Whereas, if we suppose him to mean, that no Christian ought to be condemned who had relinquished the Jewish ritual, and joined in transferring the sabbatical institution from the seventh to the first day of the week, in honour of the resurrection of our Redeemer, the passage becomes void of difficulty, or contradiction to other passages of the New Testament.

No farther arguments, I trust, are necessary to show the nature and obligation of the Christian Sabbath; but I cannot dismiss this part of my subject without mentioning one reflection, which has often forcibly impressed my own mind.

It is acknowledged on all hands, that Christians are favoured with a clearer knowledge of the divine will than had been vouchsafed to mankind before the coming of Christ; that the motives to love and serve God are increased under the Gospel Dispensation; and that a more abundant effusion of the Holy Spirit has been granted since the glorification of Christ.

It might, therefore, be reasonably expected, that the character of pious Christians should be somewhat superior to that of pious Jews; that the clearer views of the love and mercy of God in our redemption, and of our infinite obligations to our Redeemer, should produce greater delight in those holy exercises which are so well calculated to call forth our gratitude and excite our love. Yet if a sabbatical institution, as described by the prophet Isaiah, is not binding upon Christians as it was upon the Jews, this comparison must be reversed; and the employments of the Sabbath must have been more spiritual under the Jewish than under the Christian Dispensation.

I see the pious Jew abstracting himself every seventh day from the cares and concerns of this life, joining in the ordinances of worship with a *delight*, which would render every other employment on that day insipid; and directing his *pleasures and conversation* in conformity to the peculiar duties of that holy season. Whereas, the pious Christian (if the observance of the Sabbath is

not a breach of Christianity) must fall short of the pious Jew in the spiritual frame of his mind on that day; and as far as the exercises of that day have influence, in the general spirituality of his disposition. The Christian will not, indeed, neglect the publick services of religion, which the laws and customs of his country may have appointed for the day; but then, *one will go to his farm, and another to his merchandize*; or, at least, his thoughts and conversation will be engaged by these subjects, or his time spent in some unprofitable amusement, unless he performs what he must conceive to be a work of supererogation.

Every one, however, who has made the trial, must be sensible of the advantage which his mind derives from the employment of himself in religious exercises, of one kind or other, during the whole of the Sabbath-day. The influence of such conduct on the temper of our minds, during the remainder of the week, is not small. On the contrary, a total neglect of the peculiar duties of the day, seems, from experience, to be inconsistent with a state of religion. How forcibly do these considerations point out the value of this institution, and show, that we ought to regard as a favour, the permission to spend one day in seven as a *Sabbath to the Lord*, even if this had not been made a subject of command! W. H.

[To be continued.]

From the Utica Christian Repository.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—BY BUNYANUS.

CHAPTER VI.

Then said the Interpreter, I will show you one thing more. So he took them to a prison, and

showed them a prisoner who had been sentenced to solitary confinement at hard labour for a certain time, which was specified in the law, which time had now expired. And as the keeper of the prison came to the door, the prisoner called to him, and said, my time is out—I have suffered all the punishment which the law required—I demand my discharge. So the keeper unlocked the door, and set him at liberty.

Then said the pilgrims, what means this.

In. Do you understand the ground on which this man was discharged? Was it on the ground of justice, or on the ground of mercy?

Th. I think I understand it. It was on the ground that he had suffered all the punishment which the law required. He was discharged on the ground of justice. I see no mercy in the case.

In. Did he ask his discharge of the keeper as a favour, or thank the keeper for granting it?

Th. No; he demanded it as his right. He gave no thanks.

In. Could the keeper have retained him any longer without being guilty of injustice?

Th. No; for having suffered all that the law required, if the keeper had retained him longer, it would have been the same as punishing one who had committed no offence.

In. The infliction of suffering upon one who has committed no offence would not be a true and proper punishment. It would be an act of oppression, however, to have detained the prisoner any longer against his will. But did the keeper say any thing about pardon?

Th. No; there was no pardon in the case.

In. No ; there was not. Pardon, or forgiveness, is the remission of a punishment which the law has denounced. But where that punishment is fully inflicted, there is nothing remitted ; and of course there is no pardon or forgiveness in the case.

Th. What is the application of this ?

In. It shows the absurdity of what some teach ; that men suffer all the punishment their sins deserve, either before or after death ; and yet are pardoned, forgiven, or made the subjects of mercy. If any suffer the whole of the punishment which the law denounces for their sins, they are not saved by Christ—they are not subjects of mercy—they have nothing forgiven them—they are not treated with grace—they have no occasion to ask for their discharge as a favour—they may demand it as their right—their discharge is an act of justice—they have no thanks to give for it.

This transaction also shows the absurdity of what some teach ; that the sins of men were punished in the person of Christ, and yet are forgiven. The same sin cannot be both fully punished, and freely pardoned or forgiven. Forgiveness is the remission of that punishment which might justly be inflicted. But a crime cannot be justly punished twice over. Therefore, if the sins of men had been punished in the person of Christ, they could not be justly punished again in them ; and consequently, they must be discharged on the ground of justice. They might be under great obligations to him for suffering their punishment for them, and to the Father for giving his son to do this ; but they could be under no obligations to him for their dis-

charge itself, after this was done. Their discharge could not be an act of grace—it could not be a pardon—it could not with propriety be asked as a favour, but challenged as a right—and no thanks need be rendered for merely granting what is justly due.

Th. If the death of Christ was not a punishment of the sins of men, how does it have any efficacy in procuring their discharge ?

In. It is an expedient, devised by infinite wisdom to answer the end of punishment, without the actual infliction of that punishment, so that mercy may be exercised in remitting that punishment by a true and proper forgiveness.

Th. How does it answer that end ?

In. When Christ voluntarily submitted to die on the cross for sinners, he thereby magnified the law and made it honorable ; inasmuch as his death shows the evil of sin, and how God feels towards it, in as clear a light, (considering the dignity of his person,) as the execution of the penalty of the law upon the sinner could have shown it. It thus answers the end of punishment, and opens a door of mercy to a perishing world.

Then I perceived that the Interpreter bid the pilgrims remember the things they had seen and heard. So he gave them refreshments, and lodged them all night ; and in the morning, he questioned them in many words, out of the King's book, and further instructed them in his statutes, that they might know their Master's will, and do it, and be found faithful unto the end. So he dismissed them to go on their way, after having given them a caution to beware of the arts of three sisters, *Hypocrisy, Carnal*

Policy, and *Heresy*, with whom he told them they would be likely to meet in some part of their journey. So they gave him many thanks for his instructions and counsels, and departed.

Now I perceived that they had not gone far from the Interpreter's house, before they saw a stile over the wall, on the right hand, on which was inscribed, "THE HYPOCRITE'S HOPE." And while they stood looking, behold three men came along to that stile, and came over the wall by it into the King's highway, of whom Thoughtful and Ardent had some knowledge in the city of Destruction, and whose names were *Feel-well*, *Love-self*, and *No-law*. Then *Feel-well* came forward to shake them by the hand, and said,

F. w. How do you do, neighbours? you are going on pilgrimage I see. And so am I. I rejoice to meet you. The pilgrim's life is a happy one. I *know* it is. I wish the whole world would only try it.

Th. I believe that pilgrims have their comforts, and their sorrows; and both peculiar to themselves.

F. w. That they have their comforts, I *know*. But that is too cold a word, they have their joys. But that pilgrims should have any sorrows, I do not understand. If they do, it must be because they have so little faith.

Th. I am sensible that if I had more faith in God, more true confidence in him, and were more willing to be at his entire disposal, I should have less trouble of mind. But when I have the clearest views of God, I have also the clearest discovery of my own vileness; and that fills me with the deepest sorrow for my sins. I loathe and abhor myself,

and grieve that I have dishonoured my Lord and King.

F. w. I perceive that you do not understand me. I mean by faith, the belief that *my* sins are pardoned, and that *I* shall be received at the gate of the Celestial City. I *know* this by my own feelings. And therefore I am full of joy.

Th. You seem to be very confident that you shall be received at the Celestial gate. But I am afraid you will be disappointed; for I perceive you did not come in by the door, but climbed up some other way. You have come over the stile of the hypocrite's hope; and I apprehend your end will be according to your beginning.

F. w. If we are in the way, we are in it; and it matters not how we came in. I therefore cordially embrace you as a brother pilgrim, though you feel so uncharitable towards me. But I doubt not that the way we came is as good, if not better than yours. I am certain it was much more agreeable. For, though we heard Evangelist as well as you, we did not like his preaching, and we could not bear his directions. And if we had heard no other, we should never have been persuaded to set out on pilgrimage. But we chose to hear every one that we could. I liked Doctor Smoothman pretty well; but he had not zeal enough. I did not like Doctor Soothing, because he would have me wait the King's time, and I was for doing something at once. I did not like Mr. Save-all, because he would have us all stay in the city till it was burned, and then go by a short way to the Celestial country, in a chariot of fire. I did not like the mode of conveyance. But I disliked Evangelist more than all the rest; and I have no doubt that he hin-

ders more from going on pilgrimage, than even Mr. Save-all himself. But I liked the man they nick-name Mr. *Blind-guide*, but whose true name he told me, is *Guide-to-the-blind*. He pleased me exactly. He told me of this way into the way, by which we have come. And he furnished us with a conductor called *Repentance*, who accompanied us as long as we had need of him, even to the house of Mr. *Self-confidence*, in the village of *Peace-in-believing*, which we entered by the gate of *Experience*, and where we lodged one night, and saw glorious things. From that place to this stile, over which we have come, the way has been smooth and pleasant.

Here Ardent sighed deeply, and shook his head. Then Feel-well said to him;

F. w. What is the matter, brother Ardent?

Ard. I remember Mr. *Blind-guide*, to my sorrow. I disliked Evangelist's instructions at first, as you did, and went to Mr. *Blind-guide* for directions. He sent me, as he did you, to the village of *False-peace*, where I abode with Mr. *Self-confidence* a considerable time, and having returned to our city, I was well nigh lost forever.

F. w. Aye, true indeed. You fell away: you turned back. Had you only kept on as I have, all had been well. Hold on, and hold out, is my maxim; and that I am determined to do, till I reach the Celestial City, and shout hosannas to the King of Glory.

Love-self. If I only get through at last, I shall be satisfied; though I confess I have not always the same confidence of it that brother Feel-well has. I have my doubts occasionally, which make me very unhappy while they last.

But I feel better since I have got over this stile, and find myself safe in the King's Highway.

No-law. I have no doubts, and never have had, since we got to the village of *Peace-in-believing*. It was there revealed to me in a dream, the night we lodged with Mr. *Self-confidence*, that the Prince Immanuel had taken all my sins, and given me all his righteousness. If I step occasionally out of the way, it never troubles me any, since I know that the Prince Immanuel bore the punishment of it all.

By this time, I perceived that the company drew near to the cross, and had a view of Him who bled thereon. And I thought they all appeared to be more or less moved at the sight, but expressed their feelings in different ways. Feel-well jumped up and down, and clapped his hands, and shouted aloud. Love-self sat down and contemplated the sight with a cheerful countenance. No-law stood and looked attentively, but without much emotion. Ardent wept aloud; and Thoughtful stood apart, looking intensely at the cross, with a countenance of deep solemnity, while a few tears trickled down his cheeks.

Oh, (said Feel-well,) how can I express my joy at this sight? It fills my soul with ecstasy. I see here the assurance of my acceptance at the Celestial gate. There hangs the man who died for me. How can I help loving him for his great love to me; let those hold their peace who cannot feel. I want a religion that I can feel. And I thank the King that I do feel his love shed abroad in my heart. Glory to the King! Glory to the Prince who died for me! Glory! Glory!

Now, (said Love-self,) I see my title clear, I see my sins re-

moved. He bore them all for me. By his obedience to the law in my room, I am justified and accepted. I will doubt no more.

Here, (said No-law,) I see how unnecessary are good works. The finished righteousness of the Prince Immanuel does not need any additions of ours. I read that he justifies the ungodly; and I come to be justified as ungodly. I make no pretences to any righteousness of my own.

I see here, (said Ardent,) the effect of my sins. They pierced the hands and feet of the Prince of Life. They inflicted those cruel wounds which seem to bleed afresh, as I look upon them. In view of this scene, how vile and hateful my sins appear! Oh that my head were waters, and mine eyes were fountains of tears, that I might weep day and night for my base ingratitude. How vile I am! How loathsome I appear to myself!

Here, (said Thoughtful,) appears the great evil of sin. It occasioned the death of the King of Glory. Here I see the great love of God to a sinful world, in giving his only begotten Son to die for them. Here I see the infinite condescension of the Prince Immanuel, who, though he was rich, yet for our sakes became poor, that we, through his poverty, might be rich. Here I see God's regard for his law, the honour of which was maintained at such an expense. From this scene, we may draw motives for a holy life; for how shall we who are dead to sin, by the cross, live any longer therein. BUNYANUS.

INSPIRATION.

If we should suppose that it were as uncommon for men to see, as it is to be born blind; would

not the few who had this rare gift appear as prophets and inspired teachers to the many? We conceive inspiration to give a man no new faculty, but to communicate to him in a new way and by extraordinary means, what the faculties common to mankind can apprehend, and what he can communicate to others by ordinary means. On the supposition we have made, sight would appear to the blind very similar to this; for the few who had this gift would communicate the knowledge acquired by it to those who had it not. They could not, indeed, convey to the blind any distinct notion of the manner in which they acquired this knowledge. A ball and socket would seem to a blind man, in this case, as improper an instrument for acquiring such a variety and extent of knowledge, as a dream or a vision. The manner in which a man who sees, discerns so many things by means of the eye, is as unintelligible to the blind, as the manner in which a man may be inspired with knowledge by the Almighty, is to us. Ought the blind man, therefore, without examination, to treat all pretences to the gift of seeing, as imposture? Might he not, if he were candid and tractable, find reasonable evidence of the reality of this gift in others, and draw great advantages from it to himself?

Reid.

ANECDOTE.

The late Rev. WILLIAM ROMANE, of London, in crossing the Black Friar's bridge, came up with a man who, in a style of unusual and fearful impiety, called upon God "*to damn his soul for CHRIST's sake!*" Mr. Romaine,

laying his hand upon the blasphemer's shoulder, said ; "*My friend, God has done many things for Christ's sake, and perhaps he will do THAT too ;*" and passed on. The reproof, quite as original as the imprecation, went to the wretch's heart ; and was the occasion of his "turning from the power of Satan unto God," and becoming an exemplary follower of that Redeemer whom he had been in the habit of insulting. "A word spoken in due season, how good is it ?" The power of JESUS to save, how mighty ! His grace, how free !

A STRANGE SIGHT.

It is indeed a strange sight to see those who complain they can do nothing without Christ, labouring hard, and those who boast they can do great things, standing idle,—to see those who renounce all dependence upon their good works, abounding in good works ; and those who expect to be saved by their good works, living in neglect of good works, and doing the works of the Devil.

Davies.

From the Christian's Magazine.

ANECDOTE OF DR. D——,

Illustrative of the difference between a speculative and practical knowledge of the truths of the gospel.

With the most splendid talents and highest improvements, *the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God ; for they are foolishness unto him ; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.* Whatever difficulties may arise in drawing a discriminating line between the rational powers of the mind, in its ordinary exercises, and those

which relate to God and the spiritual life, it is very certain there is an essential difference between them. The express declarations of scripture establish this difference, and it is daily confirmed by observation. Learned men are not always pious. Nay, among those who have advanced far in science, and acquired great reputation for their extensive researches, and vast erudition, are often found the most implacable enemies to both natural and revealed religion. With all their knowledge, they are ignorant of the only true God and Jesus Christ, whom to know is life eternal. They have not discovered the spirituality of the divine law, its principle, and extent ; nor understood the scope of the gospel, the duties it enjoins, and the blessings it reveals. Those who have been effectually called out of darkness, and by renewing and irresistible grace, brought into marvellous light, are conscious of this difference and willing to acknowledge it. But as the greatest number of these were, previously to their conversion, uninstructed in the doctrines of salvation, and had, perhaps, never read the sacred scriptures with attention, the comparative estimate of their former knowledge cannot, by themselves or others, be accurately ascertained. A very singular instance, which illustrates the difference between speculative and practical knowledge, and which is worth preserving, is sent for that purpose to be inserted in the Christian's Magazine.

Dr. D—— was a man of strong mind and extensive reading ; of an amiable disposition and polished manners. He had nearly finished his course of studies in the university of Groningen, and had obtained the degree of Doctor of

Philosophy, a grade in literary honours conferred by some universities on the continent of Europe. He had published a Treatise in Latin, *de Systemate Leibnitiano, de vera miraculi Notione, et de speciali Dei Providentia*, which established his reputation as a scholar of the first rank. As he had devoted himself to the study of theology, he left Groningen in the year 1767, and came to Utrecht, where the most celebrated professor in theology, at that time drew students to attend his lectures from every quarter. Dr. D— professed a deep reverence for the Christian religion. He had studied the doctrines, was thoroughly learned in the arguments by which they are maintained and defended, and had determined soon to enter into the ministry. But with all his learning and decent profession, he was a stranger to the saving influence of divine grace; and had never experienced the converting power of the truth upon his own heart. He was satisfied with a speculative knowledge, and supposed that nothing more was necessary to fit him for the ministry, or render him safe as it respected his own peace and happiness.

A friend, who was in habits of intimacy with him, calling one morning to see him, observed a pensive air, and an unusual seriousness mixed with distress in his countenance, which prompted an immediate inquiry respecting the cause of his disquietude. Without the least reserve, he communicated the state of his mind, and the occasion which had produced it.

The preceding evening he had received a letter, which informed him of the death of an excellent man, the Rev. Dr. N—, whom he greatly loved, and with whom

he had lived in the strictest bonds of friendship from early youth. Oppressed with grief, he first felt the pangs which such an event is calculated to excite. But the sensibility of nature soon gave place to other reflections, and aroused anxieties and feelings of a different kind. The death of his friend introduced his own death to view. He realized the possibility of being also cut down suddenly in the prime of life. Eternity, with all its solemn importance and consequences, impressed his soul: then, for the first time in his life, he was convinced of his misery. He then saw and felt that he was a guilty, depraved sinner, that he had no resources in himself, no righteousness of his own. Alarmed and distressed, he had passed the night with conflicting passions, and sought consolation in vain from all he knew of the gospel. He had now become as calm as, under such impressions it is perhaps possible to be, and appeared sincerely desirous of instruction. "Tell me," said he, with great eagerness, "tell me where and how a wounded and accusing conscience can find peace? What must I do to be saved?" After some observations which were judged applicable to his present exercises, his friend referred him to the precious atonement of the divine Redeemer, and the imputation of his perfect righteousness,* by which the greatest of sinners who believe in Jesus, are justified. But of this, added his friend, you need no information; you are intimately acquainted with the doctrines of the gospel. "It is true," he replied, "it is true, I am acquainted with those doc-

* We believe that the sinner is justified by the atonement of Christ. But that the perfect righteousness of Christ is imputed to the sinner, we do not believe.—Editors.

trines. I have studied them, I understand them individually, and in their connexion, and can explain them to others, and defend them against adversaries. But my knowledge is merely speculative, I have only viewed them in theory as perfect and divine ; but never applied them to myself. I know not how to repent, or how to believe. I know no more how to approach a throne of grace as a condemned sinner, or with what exercises and in what way to come to Jesus, than the most ignorant creature on earth. "Sit down," added he, "and instruct me."

An instance so striking and pointed seldom occurs, where a man of great learning and information, even in the truths of religion, was laid as low at the footstool of sovereign grace, as the

most ignorant sinner ; and where the difference between speculative and experimental knowledge is so clearly displayed.—It need only be added, it pleased the Lord to direct his humble convert, and bring him through faith in Christ, to joy and peace in believing. He became sometime afterwards a Minister, was settled in the church, and as highly respected for his piety and usefulness, as he was before for his erudition. He is probably still living, and bearing testimony from his own experience, to the necessity of a new heart, and the teaching of the Holy Spirit to salvation.

The writer of this anecdote is himself the friend alluded to above. He has a perfect recollection of the affecting interview, and can vouch for the truth of this little narrative.

Religious Intelligence.

The unfavourable changes which have recently taken place in the Russian policy, have been such as to palsy in a great measure, the efforts of the Russian Bible Society, and to cause the suspension of all the Scotch Missions in Russia, except the station at Karass.—The Bible Society, which for several years, pursued so distinguished a course, and promised to supply with the word of life, not only the Russian population, but the numerous Heathen and Mahomedan tribes of that wide extended empire, is now completely paralyzed in its exertions, and appears to be dying a lingering death. In consequence of the powerful opposition which

was raised to the Bible Society, Prince Galatzin, its noble President, retired from that office ; he, at the same time, resigned his situation as minister of religion, and a Russian Admiral was appointed in his place. Its no less excellent Secretary, Mr. Papoff, who visited this country about two years ago, and who was connected with the censorship of the press, was afterward put on his trial by the Criminal Court, respecting a book which had been published by Pastor Gossner, in which there were some reflections which were considered as somewhat unfavourable to the doctrine of the Greek Church relative to the Virgin Mary. Several others

were also involved in the same prosecution, two of them pious men. Pastor Gossner himself, who, though a Catholic, is said to be a most eloquent, evangelical, and useful preacher, had, previously to this, been ordered away from Petersburg on a few days notice. The powers of darkness, in short, appear to be mustering their forces in the Russian empire: the measures pursued seem to be a part of that general system for arresting the progress of light, and for involving the nations in all the darkness of the middle ages, which has of late years constituted the distinguishing characteristic of the policy of most of the Continental princes.

Boston Rec. & Tel.

THE MISSIONARIES IN BURMAH SAFE.

It is now a long time since our churches have been held in painful suspense with respect to the fate of the Rev. Dr. Judson and his wife, Missionaries at Ava, in the kingdom of Burmah. This suspense is now happily ended by a letter from Edward A. Newton, Esq. of Calcutta, to Mr. Evarts, the Corresponding Secretary of the Board of Missions. It is dated Calcutta, May 23, 1825, and is as follows:

My Dear Sir,—It gives me infinite pleasure to acquaint you, that Mr. and Mrs. Judson are alive and well. Accounts have this day been received of them. They have been liberated and sent with other European prisoners to treat with the British Commander for peace. Peace will undoubtedly be made immediately, and all be well. I request you to give all possible publicity to this communication,

as the Christian world is deeply interested in the fate of these respected persons.

E. A. NEWTON.

Mis. Her.

PROPOSED UNION.

We learn from various parts of the country that the contemplated union between the United Foreign Missionary Society, and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, is hailed as a most auspicious event by the friends of both institutions. On no subject within our recollection has there been more perfect unanimity. From the North and the South, and beyond the Alleghanies, the same voice of firm and decided approbation, is heard. Let all, who feel for the spiritual wants of mankind, make this an occasion for more fervent prayer for a blessing upon Missionary labours and of more active efforts to awaken our great community to the present inviting condition of many countries now stretching out their hands for the Gospel. *Ib.*

BIBLE SOCIETY.

A Society was organized in the court-house at Indianapolis, (Ind.) the 25th of Nov. 1825, entitled "The Auxiliary Bible Society for Marion Co. Indiana.

The New-York religious papers state, that the premium of fifty dollars, offered some time since for the best Tract "On the duty of professors of religion, and especially those who have wealth, to consecrate their property to the spread of the Gospel," has been awarded to the Rev. DANIEL A. CLARK, of Amherst, Mass. There were no less than 46 competitors.

Dedication.

Dec. 1,—A new and commodious Edifice was dedicated to the worship and service of God in the East Parish in Attleborough. The reading of a select portion of the Scriptures and introductory prayer by Rev. James Barney of Seekonk; the dedicatory prayer by Rev. Elisha Fisk of Wrentham; sermon by Rev. John Furgerson; concluding prayer by Rev. John Wilder. The Music was well chosen, and performed in a manner highly to interest and gratify the numerous and respectable

audience. The Sermon by the Pastor was very appropriate to the occasion, and indicated a strong and original mind, cultivated by study, and enriched with Theological acquisitions. The building itself and the unanimity with which it was erected and completed, do great honour to the people in that place. The cordiality which subsists between the Pastor and the Church and Society, promises peace and prosperity to that part of Zion.

Ordinations and Installations.

March 5,—Rev. Mr. BRUSH was ordained Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Indianapolis, Indiana. Sermon by Rev. John F. Crow.

April 13,—Rev. BAYNARD R. HALL was ordained Pastor of the Church in Bloomington, Indiana. Sermon by Rev. Isaac Reed.

June 4,—Rev. ALEXANDER WILLIAMSON was ordained as an Evangelist, in Charlestown, Indiana.

June 4,—Rev. TILLY H. BROWN was ordained Pastor of the United Churches of Bethlehem and Blue River, Indiana. Sermon by Rev. Isaac Reed.

August,—Rev. STEPHEN BLISS was ordained at Vincennes, Indiana, to the work of the Ministry.

At the same time, Rev. Mr. SCOTT was installed Pastor of the Church at Indiana.

November,—Rev. HENRY H. F. SWEET was ordained Pastor of the Church in Palmer. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Ide.

December 27,—Rev. STEPHEN M. WHELOCK was installed Pastor of the Congregational Church in Warren, Vt.; and on the same occasion, Rev. GEORGE FREEMAN was ordained to the work of an Evangelist. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Chandler of Waitesfield.

December 28,—Rev. JAMES D. KNOWLES was ordained Pastor of the 2d Baptist Church in Boston. Sermon by Rev. Prof. Chase, of the Theolog. Institution, Newton.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

F. is received and will be duly noticed.

We are obliged to our Correspondents who have enriched our pages with their valuable productions, and we sincerely hope that they will still favour us and the publick with their communications, and that others will contribute to our work from their Theological treasures.

Subscriptions and Payments for the Christian Magazine, received by the following gentlemen :

<i>Boston.</i>	<i>Sandwich.</i>
T. R. Marvin, <i>Congress-street.</i>	Rev. David L. Hunn.
<i>Franklin.</i>	<i>Plympton.</i>
Rev. Nathaniel Emmons, D. D.	Rev. Elijah Dexter.
<i>Wrentham.</i>	<i>Carver.</i>
Rev. Elisha Fisk,	Rev. Luther Wright.
Rev. Moses Thatcher.	<i>Uxbridge.</i>
<i>Medway.</i>	Rev. Samuel Judson.
Rev. Jacob Ide,	<i>Ward.</i>
Rev. Luther Bailey.	Rev. Enoch Pond.
<i>Attleborough.</i>	<i>Harvard.</i>
Rev. John Ferguson,	Rev. George Fisher.
Mr. Samuel Tyler.	<i>Foxborough.</i>
<i>Hopkinton.</i>	Rev. Willard Pierce.
Rev. Nathaniel Howe.	<i>Plymouth.</i>
<i>Newburyport.</i>	Mr. John Harlow.
Mr. Charles Whipple.	<i>Fitchburgh.</i>
<i>Andover.</i>	Rev. Mr. Putnam.
Mr. Henry C. Jewett.	<i>Waltham.</i>
<i>Taunton.</i>	Rev. Sewall Harding.
Rev. Alvan Cobb.	<i>Upton.</i>
<i>New-Bedford.</i>	Dea. Daniel Fisk.
Deacon Barker.	<i>Sutton.</i>
<i>Middleborough.</i>	Doctor David March.
Capt. Nathaniel Eddy.	<i>Seekonk.</i>
<i>Abington.</i>	Dea. Elihu Carpenter.
Rev. Samuel W. Colburn,	<i>Ashford, Conn.</i>
Rev. Samuel Spring.	Rev. Reuben Torrey.
<i>Weymouth.</i>	<i>New-York City.</i>
Rev. William Tyler.	Mr. Lowell Holbrook, <i>Merchant.</i>
<i>Randolph.</i>	<i>Providence, R. I.</i>
Rev. David Brigham.	Mr. Samuel Billings, <i>No. 35 South</i>
<i>Wareham.</i>	<i>Main Street.</i>
Rev. Mr. Hemenway.	

N. B. Subscribers are desired to give information to the Printer, in what way they wish to have their Magazines sent to them, if they are not accommodated with the present arrangement.